# Instructions for Completing CDF's CAA Report Form

by:
CDF Archaeology Program Staff
Revised December 18, 2002

## General Information Concerning the Form

**Statement of Purpose:** This document was prepared by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) to provide direction to Registered Professional Foresters (RPFs), Professional Archaeologists, and other Resource Professionals in the task of completing CDF's Confidential Archaeological Addendum (CAA) Report Form. The CAA is an archaeological survey report that may be used to document an archaeological and historical resource survey and impact assessment for a Timber Harvesting Plan (THP) Nonindustrial Timberland Management Plan (NTMP), Program Timber Harvesting Plan (PTHP), Emergency Notice (EM), Modified Timber Harvesting Plan (MTHP), or other commercial timber operation on privately-owned or other nonfederal lands within California pursuant to California's Forest Practice Regulations [14 CCR Sections 895.1, 929, 949, 969, 1035, 1037.5, 1038(b)(10), 1051(a)(12), 1052(a), 1092.14(f), and 1104(a)(3)].

The purpose of the CAA is to demonstrate conformance with applicable Forest Practice Rules. It also serves as a confidential technical addendum to the plan listing all identified archaeological and/or historical sites and how they will be protected. This information is reviewed by CDF but not made available to the general public in order to prevent disclosure of sensitive resource locations to unauthorized individuals. The completed CAA also functions as a professional archaeological survey report that is reviewed by CDF for completeness, accuracy, and professional adequacy. Once approved by CDF the completed CAA is forwarded to the appropriate Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System for permanent retention so that this information can be added to the state's database of cultural resources and benefit future management or research on the property.

The CAA documents the archaeological survey and impact assessment work conducted during the preparation of a plan. RPFs are required to conduct a current archaeological records check, consult with Native Americans, ensure that research is conducted prior to the field survey, and provide a Professional Archaeologist or a person who has satisfactorily completed a CDF Archaeological Training Course within the past five years prior to submission of the project to CDF to conduct a field survey for archaeological and historical sites within the site survey area. The site survey area includes the entire logging area and those portions of appurtenant roads where timber operations could affect an archaeological or historical site will take place. The RPF is also responsible for recording identified archaeological or historical sites in accordance with professional standards. This includes all sites determined to be significant as well as those for which no determination of significance has been made but which the RPF chooses to record. The RPF is required to develop specific enforceable protection measures to be implemented both within the site boundaries as well as within 100 feet of the site boundaries, and, prior to the start of timber operations, meet with the LTO at each archaeological site requiring avoidance or other forms of protection to discuss the specific actions the LTO must take to ensure protection of the sites. All of this information is contained in the CAA.

**General Instructions Concerning the Use of the CAA Report Form:** CDF first created the CAA form in 1991 and has revised it several times. The current version of the CAA report form was created in December 2002 to accommodate recent revisions to Forest Practice Rules that take effect on January 1, 2003. RPFs are encouraged to discontinue use of older versions of the CAA form. We recommend RPFs delete these older files from their computers and replace them with the most current version provided by CDF, available in Microsoft Word format from the CDF Archaeology Program Web Site at http://www.indiana.edu/~e472/cdf/forms/forms.html or through written request by email to any of CDF's staff archaeologists. From 1991 through 2002 the CAA form was incorporated into the Forest Practice Rules and RPFs were required to use that specific form. This is no longer required. Although the current Forest Practice Rules contain a definition for a CAA (see Section 895.1) and a detailed list of required items of information that must be included in it (see Section 929.1(c)), RPFs are not specifically required to use the CAA form provided by CDF. We encourage the use of this report form to help RPFs ensure that all required information is included and to enable CDF staff to quickly locate and review the required information during review of the plan. RPFs are also encouraged to make modifications to the report form to customize features and improve the professional presentation of the report.

**Recent Revisions to the CAA Report Form:** The CAA report form was revised recently in order to take into account a set of rule revisions adopted by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection on October 3, 2002 that take effect on January 1, 2003. For example, there are new rules pertaining to Native American consultation. Under the new Rules, second written notice must be sent to appropriate Native American tribal groups and individuals if a Native American archaeological or cultural site is identified within the site survey area of a plan. Part 3 of the CAA now guides the RPF to include the results of the first mailing to Native Americans required for all plans (called "Information Request" on the CAA form), and the second mailing, if required (called "Notification to Native Americans"). Inclusion of the date of the Native American Contact List being used by the RPF is another new requirement. These and other rule changes are reflected in the new CAA report form. The revisions were motivated by an additional objective – to encourage RPFs to produce a more complete, professional report that looks more like a survey report and less like a completed form. For this reason all of the prompter information has been removed and the relevant guidance it contained is now included within this set of instructions.

## Suggestions for Completing the CAA Report Form

**Archaeological Records Checks:** RPFs submit a records check request to the appropriate Information Center (IC). This request shall include the legal description of the project as well as a photocopied portion of a USGS 7.5'quadrangle with the project area outlined. The CDF Archaeologist reviewing the CAA will compare the map used to initiate the records check to the THP map contained in the plan to verify that the entire project area has been covered by the records check. Additional records search costs and delays could result if the records check does not include the entire project area. In such situations the plan will probably be returned and the submitter then required to conduct an additional check for the new area.

**Written Notification and Information Requests to Native Americans:** CDF recommends this step be completed early in the process of developing a plan (such as the same time as the archaeological records check) in order to avoid delays, allow time for Native American groups and/or individuals to respond, and create the opportunity for the RPF to document the results of any consultation that may follow receipt of the notification letters. Use the most current version of the

CDF Native American Contact List (NACL) available at the time of THP preparation. As of January 2003, the NACL will no longer be mailed to RPFs every January as in past years. The current list can be obtained from the CDF Archaeology Program Web Site at http://www.indiana.edu/~e472/cdf/contacts. The list is also available by submitting an email or written request to CDF Archaeology Program Manager Dan Foster at dan.foster@fire.ca.gov. The list is updated monthly and the current list is usually posted during the first week of each month.

The Notification Letter must include the following items: (A) request information concerning their knowledge of archaeological or historical sites within the THP boundaries, (B) provide a description of the plan location including the county, section, township, range, base and meridian, and the approximate direction and distance from the nearest community or well-known landmark, (C) provide two maps--a general location map such as a Thomas Brothers Map that shows the travel route from the nearest community or well known landmark to the plan area and a copy of the relevant portion of the USGS topographic quadrangle map clearly depicting the location of the plan boundary as well as a map legend and scale, (D) provide a statement that all replies, comments, questions or other information should be directed to the RPF and provide the RPF's name, address, and telephone number, (E) indicate that the RPF is requesting a response within ten days from the date of the notice so the information can be incorporated into the plan when initially submitted to the Director, (F) provide the estimated date the plan will be submitted to Director, (G) include the following statement: "The earliest possible date the Director may approve the plan is 16 calendar days after it is submitted to Director, although typically, the plan is reviewed for at least 45 calendar days following plan submittal before the Director approves the plan," (H) include a statement that the Native American groups and/or individuals may participate in the plan review process by submitting written comments to the Director before close of public comment period and provide the address and telephone number of the appropriate CDF Forest Practice Office, (I) provide a statement that locations of sites disclosed will be kept confidential, (J) lastly, provide a statement that a Confidential Archaeological Addendum (CAA) will be prepared for the plan and a copy of pertinent information contained within the CAA may, at the discretion of the Director, be obtained from the Director. Sample Native American notification letters are also posted on the CDF Archaeology Program Web Site at http://www.indiana.edu/~e472/cdf/contacts

**Prefield Research:** RPFs are required to ensure that adequate and appropriate prefield research is conducted prior to the field survey and information concerning this research is a required component of the CAA. The purpose of this research is to get prepared to conduct the survey, become familiar with the types of resources likely to be encountered within the project area, and to be ready to interpret, record, and evaluate these findings within the context of local history and prehistory. The investigator should review records, study maps, read pertinent ethnographic, archaeological, and historical literature specific to the area being studied, and conduct other tasks to maximize the effectiveness of the survey. The *Handbook of the Indians of California* (Kroeber 1925) and the *Handbook of North American Indians - Volume 8 – California* (Smithsonian Institution 1978) are the two primary ethnographic sources to be reviewed. Determine which tribal group or groups occupied the area containing the proposed project and review information about those tribal groups. In Part 4 of the CAA list the references used. Another excellent source that should be checked every time is the General Land Office (GLO) plat maps for the township containing the project. Most GLO plat maps date from the 1850s to the 1870s although some are as late as 1900. The GLO surveyors often mapped homesteads, cabins, orchards, roads, trails, fencelines, mining areas, etc. that were observed during their survey. If any such features are depicted on the map within what is now the project area, a careful search should be made for surviving remnants of them or of unmapped associated features or artifacts. GLO plat maps can be an excellent source for dating historic features discovered on your archaeological survey. The GLO surveyor's notes usually accompany the plats and review of these is sometimes useful as well. GLO plat maps and records may be obtained through the mail or in-person at the Bureau of Land Management Office of Survey Records in Sacramento. It is prudent to call first: (916) 978-4330. There is a fee per copy (24" X 36"). GLO plat maps are also kept on file at many of the Information Centers. The Information Centers can usually provide a copy of a relevant portion of a GLO plat map as part of a Complete Records Check. Old topographic maps, if available, should be examined for the locations of old houses, roads and other features that may have been displayed on these early maps but not on current USGS topographic quadrangle maps. Consulting a series of aerial photographs taken over a period of time can help date historic structures and aid in the assessment of the types of previous land-use practices and prior ground disturbances. Persons contacted should include individuals belonging to any local historical society, agency archaeologists, landowners, ranchers, neighbors, and/or other knowledgeable individuals that may have lived or worked in the area being studied. Prefield research should also include a review of archaeological reports (either survey reports or excavation reports) and/or site records for the local area. This review will provide specific examples of the kinds of cultural resources that have been previously discovered in the general area, a discussion of archaeological, historical, and ethnographic information pertaining to the area being studied, and examples of typical artifact assemblages. Look for site location patterning and the types of artifacts or features being recorded. Many RPFs simply list the Reference Manual and Study Guide for the CDF-CLFA Archaeological Training Program For Registered Professional Foresters And Other Resource Professionals (Manual) as a reference that was checked as part of prefield research. It is preferable to instead specify which references in the Manual were reviewed.

**Archaeological Survey of the Project:** An archaeological survey must be conducted within the entire site survey area (as defined in 14 CCR 895.1) for the project. The methods and techniques employed to achieve adequate coverage will vary based upon a variety of factors. These include the physical characteristics of the property, especially topographic and other environmental attributes, and other information gathered during the records check, in response to the Native American information request, and/or other prefield research, as well as the results of archaeological inventories in areas with a similar cultural and natural setting. There are four different levels of archaeological survey coverage intensity: complete, general, intuitive, and cursory. These are described below:

- **Complete** A complete reconnaissance is one in which archaeologically-trained individuals systematically traverse the area at 10 meter intervals or less, looking carefully for all evidence of prior human activity. Team members usually walk abreast. All archaeological phenomena in a given area may not be visible or as easily definable at the same time: different seasons, varying light conditions, differential erosion, and deadfall cover will obscure the investigator's vision or reveal certain remains at different times. Nevertheless, most features should be observable to a trained surveyor walking over the entire area under investigation in a complete manner. Coverage shall be sufficient to allow the investigator to encounter the smallest of the archaeological sites likely to occur in the area under study. Spacing must be narrow enough and ground cover must be modified (if it is an observational problem) to the extent that will allow the investigator to locate the sites. If needed, ground cover modifications (e.g., systematic removal of duff) shall be used to allow inspection of mineral soil for evidence of human activity. During a complete reconnaissance areas will be encountered that could contain archaeological remains (such as prominent rock outcroppings, benches, suspicious-looking features, possible artifacts, etc.). These areas should be intensively covered ("belly-crawled") to determine if archaeological remains are present before transect coverage is resumed.

- **General** A general reconnaissance is one in which an attempt is made to systematically cover an area as in a complete reconnaissance but with wider transect intervals. This might be due to steepness of slope, absence of water, or because of other physical conditions or observational constraints (e.g., deadfall, brush, steep slopes). Transect spacing may be increased to 30 meters where large areas are covered by thick duff.

- **Intuitive** Detailed inspection is given only to specific localities that exhibit previously identified characteristics that may be associated with the location of archaeological properties. Coverage is usually accomplished by traverses 30-50 meters apart. For example, if the reconnaissance is within a steep timberland and controlled studies show that remains of historic activities are not expected for the area and prehistoric sites occur only on benches and near springs, the investigator might then be justified in covering the area in a manner sufficient to locate those natural phenomena that have potential for association with the location of archaeological sites. Detailed inspection is reserved for those areas identified as archaeologically sensitive. Localities within low potential areas that shall receive detailed inspection in this study include springs, seeps, and low rises in flat plains.

- **Cursory** A cursory reconnaissance is one in which the inspector gives the areas a quick field inspection rather than intensive coverage. Sometimes these areas can be examined by walking briefly through and checking likely or probable spots close to the line of travel. Such methods should be employed along with visual aids (e.g., aerial photographs) to ensure that specific localities that exhibit characteristics that may be associated with archaeological site locations are not overlooked. The environmental factors that should be scanned for have been mentioned above.

## Suggestions for Completing the CAA Form

**Title Block and Signature:** The title block must contain the plan name, county, author's name, author's affiliation, address, and phone number. Provide the date the report was written and have the RPF or archaeological surveyor sign the title page. [Be sure to delete the parentheses which were placed on the form only to guide the insertion of the appropriate project specific information.] The following is a typical example of how the title block should appear:

An Archaeological Survey Report for the
Cold Stream Timber Harvesting Plan
Shasta County, California

by:

Joe Forester
District Forester, RPF #0001
Lumber Producing Industries
1234 Mill Street
Woodville, CA 90000
(123) 456-7890

January 23, 2003

(Signature of Joe Forester)

Feel free to use the acronym THP if the project name is lengthy or replace the words Timber Harvesting Plan with Nonindustrial Timber Management Plan, Program Timber Harvesting Plan, or Emergency Notice if the survey report is supporting one of those types of timber operations rather than a conventional THP. If the RPF is the author of the CAA and the archaeological surveyor, then their affiliation/title, mailing address, and telephone number need not be repeated in Part 1 and Part 5 of the CAA.

**Part 1: Project Information:** Provide the THP number if you know it. In most instances because the THP number will not be known at the time of submittal this space should be left blank. If you are asked to revise the CAA form during review of the plan you might have an opportunity to include the THP number on the revised report when resubmitted to CDF. If not, CDF will apply the THP number to the report after plan approval. It is important that the THP number is included on the final version of the CAA, which will be forwarded by CDF to the appropriate Information Center for permanent retention. List the name of the RPF preparing the plan and provide the RPF's License Number. If the RPF is not the author of the CAA and is not listed as one of the archaeological surveyors in Part 5, please also provide the RPF's affiliation, address, and phone number here in Part 1. If the RPF's affiliation, address, and phone number are already provided in either the author's information above Part 1 or in Part 5, it need not be repeated here. Provide the name of the 7.5 minute topographic quadrangle map, the name of the landowner, and the legal location. Make sure the legal location and project size match the Notice of Intent (NOI), where an NOI is required.

Provide a brief project description and be sure to include a discussion of all ground disturbing activities.

**Part 2: Archaeological Records Check Information:** A current archaeological records check conducted at the appropriate Information Center of the California Historical Resource Information System must have been conducted for this project area. A copy of the completed records check request, maps, and reply (including mapped information) from the Information Center (IC) must be included as an attachment to this report, or a justification provided as to why that is not possible. If a copy of written records check response letter from the IC cannot be attached, you are required to provide a justification, the date of the records check, the Information Center File Number, and a summary of the results discussing whether or not archaeological or historical sites are known or suspected to exist within the site survey area, and whether or not the site survey area has a previous archaeological investigation on record. Most RPFs will attach the records search information.

Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not the records check information is attached to the CAA. Although not required by the Rules, CDF recommends you also complete the summary information in addition to attaching the correspondence. This allows more efficient review by CDF. It is helpful if you include the date of the records check reply so CDF can confirm it meets the definition of a "current" archaeological records check (5 years), the Information Center File Number (a number that will appear on the reply from the IC), and a summary of the records check results. This summary should indicate whether any sites are recorded or suspected to occur within the project area and whether or not the area has previously received archaeological survey coverage.

The reason the Rules allow for the possibility that the records check information will not be attached is to accommodate those situations where the RPF did not have sufficient time to complete the check in the standard manner. The ICs may be able to perform a "rapid response" to a request (with significant increased cost) with a faxed map and a reply over the telephone---although not all of the ICs provide that particular service. Other examples include those situations where a company is utilizing an ownership-wide database. In that situation, you must attach the letter from the IC indicating the date your database was last updated and copies of any relevant portions of reports, tables, or maps applicable to the project area.

**Part 3: Native American Consultation Information:** The first half of this section must be completed for all plans. It documents the first notice and information request sent to Native Americans. The second half, beginning with the phrase "Date Notification Letters were sent to Native Americans (if applicable)" must be completed only in those instances where a Native American archaeological or cultural site was confirmed to exist within the site survey area for the project. In the first part, provide an example of an information request letter that was sent, including the maps. The information provided in this letter and map(s) will be compared to the Notice of Intent, or project map, to ensure the entire project area was covered. RPFs must also make sure the information request letters include all of the information and statements required in 14 CCR 929.1(a)(2). Two downloadable sample letters useful as templates for letters sent to Native Americans are available on the CDF Archaeology Program Web Site at http://www.indiana.edu/~e472/cdf/contacts.

List all of the Native American contacts that you provided written notification about the proposed project, the date of the CDF Native American Contact List that you used to determine the appropriate tribal contacts, and the date your letters were sent. Check the appropriate box pertaining to the results of this request and check the appropriate box pertaining to the presence or absence of Native American archaeological or cultural sites identified within the site survey area for the plan as well. If you check "No" (that such sites have not been identified), then you may delete the remaining portions of the form in this section or leave them blank. We recommend that you delete them. Be aware, however, that sites are sometimes discovered during the PHI and this section may need to be revised if the information in the first draft of the report is no longer accurate. CDF suggests you wait until immediately after the PHI before sending the Notification letters pursuant to Section 929.1(b). The problem with sending the Notification Letter earlier is that additional sites could be discovered during the PHI and the noticing requirement would need to be repeated with addition of the correct information. After the PHI RPFs usually will have a better idea as to the protection measures that CDF will support. We also suggest that the RPF sends the letters immediately after the PHI to avoid delays in THP approval since a minimum of 15 days from the date of the Notification Letter prior to the close of public comment period must be provided. A sample letter of this type is also available on the CDF Archaeology Program Web Site at the above-listed address.

This letter must, at a minimum, include:

- the name, address, and telephone number of the RPF preparing the plan,
- the name, number, or other designator of the plan,
- a list of all known Native American archaeological or cultural sites located within the site survey area, including a name, number or other designator, and a brief description of each site,
- a brief discussion of how each site shall be protected,
- the address and phone number of the appropriate CDF Office (where Second Review is held), as well as a statement that written comments may be submitted to the Director for consideration prior to the close of public comment, and
- the estimated earliest date the Director may approve the plan.

There may be times, such as when working on a plan that has been logged in the recent past, where you know the location of the Native American archaeological or cultural sites and past protection measures prior to starting your project. You have the option of combining the two letters into one if you make sure that you include all information required for both letters. If there are any changes to the plan, such as the discovery of new (i.e., previously unrecorded) archaeological sites during the PHI, or changes to the protection measures, you would then have to send an additional Notification Letter to the Native American groups and individuals previously contacted.

**Part 4: Prefield Research:** The prefield research will help you determine where you are going to intensify your survey and what you will be looking for. Suggestions on conducting prefield research were provided on page 3 of this document and will not be repeated here. Be sure to list the literature that was reviewed and the persons contacted during the required prefield research, and most importantly, provide a summary of the results of this research as it relates to this project. The following response is a quote from a CAA that is not acceptable: "Prefield research resulted in no additional information to what was already known or provided in the records check." The summary of survey results needs to include a discussion of the history of the area. Indicate which tribal group lived in the area and the nature of their settlement patterns. How may they have used the project area? Describe the historic settlement in the area. Describe the sites known in the area and the type of sites that are expected to be found in the area.

**Part 5: Training and Experience of Archaeological Surveyors:** Provide information concerning the training and qualifications of the person or persons who conducted the archaeological survey to demonstrate that the surveyors meet the qualification standards described in Section 929.4. List the name of the current archaeological surveyor. Provide that person's affiliation, address, and phone number if this information is not already included in the title block or in Part 1 of the CAA. If the archaeological survey was conducted by a person with current CDF Archaeological Training, provide the most recently completed training course number and the date the training course was completed. The training must be current (within five years) during the conduct of the survey as well as at the time of plan submission. If the current surveyor is a Professional Archaeologist check the appropriate box. If, according to the Information Center response, the project area or part of the project area had been previously surveyed, list the surveyor's name. Sometimes RPFs know of previous archaeological surveys (on, for example, large company land ownerships) that are not displayed on the IC base maps and, therefore, do not show up in the IC response letter. The names of such surveyors should be listed as well. No additional information about previous surveyors is required.

**Part 6: Survey Methods and Procedures:** The information you provide in this section is intended to describe the effort made to search for cultural resources within the project area, and to demonstrate that an adequate and appropriate effort was made. In describing the survey strategy explain the archaeological survey methods that were used. Develop your survey strategy by incorporating recommendations made by the Information Center and by using results of your prefield research. Your strategy may be influenced by additional considerations such as topography and/or other physical attributes of the property. Provide information addressing where you looked, what methods were employed, and what you were looking for. For example, CDF recommends that you not state that you were searching for bedrock mortars in Humboldt County, since to date no bedrock mortars have been identified there and, therefore, it is believed that bedrock mortars do not occur there. On the other hand, if your survey was within the Sierra Nevada region it would be quite appropriate for you to indicate that you were searching all likely rock outcrops for bedrock milling features. In other words, demonstrate that you know what you should have been looking for and that you employed a survey strategy that was appropriate for the area or region in which the property is located. CDF has produced a few articles designed to assist RPFs in developing appropriate strategies and these are available on CDF Archaeology Program Web Site and in the Reference Manual and Study Guide for the CDF-CLFA Archaeological Training Program For Registered Professional Foresters And Other Resource Professionals.

Discuss the length of time spent conducting the archaeological survey. If you indicate that only one or two days was spent on the archaeological survey for a 500 acre THP the CDF Archaeologist reviewing the plan would likely question the adequacy of your survey effort. Also provide the date or dates of your survey. It is important that you survey during good weather and at a time when you have the best ground visibility.

Discuss the survey coverage intensity. If you applied systematic survey coverage, describe your transect intervals. For surveys on smaller parcels, it is perfectly acceptable to describe a survey coverage intensity that results from looking for archaeological sites while you were cruising, marking, flagging, laying-out roads, and conducting other plan preparation activities. Coverage with adequate intensity can be accomplished with these techniques, but be sure to accurately describe how well the ground was covered. For large plans, it is better to apply different forms of systematic coverage. A lengthy discussion of systematic survey coverage is provided on pages 4-5 of this document. Discuss ground visibility and/or other limitations you encountered during the survey. If heavy duff or grass cover inhibited ground visibility and you used surface scrapes to improve your ability to see the soil, or if you observed exposed soils in road cut banks or creek banks, mention this. If portions of the project area were not included in the site survey area, be sure to explain why (i.e., the terrain was too steep, it was vegetated with abundant poison oak). Also include any other relevant information concerning your survey such as relevant details about the history of the area, any sites from a previous study, facts about previous logging history, etc.

If recorded archaeological or historical sites were identified during the archaeological records check as occurring within or adjacent to your project area, then you should attempt to relocate each site during the survey. For recorded sites adjacent to your plan area it would be helpful to relocate those sites and then determine if they extend into your project area. Be sure you have permission to enter any adjacent lands (trespassing is not recommended).

Once archaeological and/or historical sites are found you will need to determine their boundaries so they can be mapped, recorded, and protected. If flagging is to be used, we recommend printed flagging that contains the words "Special Treatment Zone."

**Part 7: Survey Results:** List and briefly describe all archaeological or historical sites identified within the site survey area, including their size, type, and condition, regardless of their significance. Display the specific location of all identified archaeological or historical sites on the attached Archaeological Coverage Map or Maps. The designations used for the sites on these maps must correspond to the designations for each of these sites in Parts 7, 8, and 9 of the CAA. This list and description must include previously recorded sites in addition to the new ones you discovered. If the Records Check shows sites that you were not able to relocate, discuss this in your survey results. Here is an example of a good site list with brief, but adequate site descriptions:

- Site #1. This is a previously recorded site, assigned the trinomial of CA-MEN-1806/H, recorded by Mark Gary in 1992. It is a multi-component site with both prehistoric and historic components. The majority of the site area contains a rich midden deposit with three possible housepits and a cupule boulder--evidence suggesting that this was a major prehistoric village site. The site appears to be in excellent condition. Artifacts observed on the surface include a rich scatter of chert and obsidian flakes and three projectile points. The historic element is the ruins of a one-room log cabin built with wire nails in circa 1920. The site measures about 250 m. X 100 m. in area.

- Site #2. I discovered this site during the survey and named it the Bear Creek Site. It is a prehistoric lithic scatter of moderate density (about 5 flakes per square meter). Chert and obsidian flakes were found but no midden, features, or flaked tools. The site measures about 50 m. X 30 m. and appears to have been disturbed by previous logging operations.

- Site #3. Another site I discovered, named the Callie Homestead, is an historic homestead with a cabin, corral and fruit trees and scattered historic artifacts including cans and bottle fragments. The site area measures about 200 ft. X 150 ft. The cabin and trees are in good condition but the corral is in ruins. Only about 10% of it has survived.

- Site #4. Another site I discovered, this one named the Bear Creek Can Scatter, is a can scatter measuring 15 X 15 feet. It contains mostly beer cans and food tins and, based on the types of cans, appears to date to circa 1950. As a scatter, there is no depth to this site, which is in poor condition since the cans are extremely rusty and markings are not legible.

- Site #5. This is the location of another recorded site, CA-MEN-1807, recorded by Jim Mismap in 1973 as a small sparse lithic scatter. I did not relocate the site during my survey. The recorded location provided by the Information Center is included on the attached Archaeological Coverage Map, but no site was observed at that location.

In the above example, all five site locations should be mapped on the Archaeological Coverage Map or Maps attached to the CAA report, and these plotted locations should be designated Sites 1 through 5. Although site descriptions in the CAA should be kept brief, the same information can be copied and pasted/inserted into the site record, but the level of detail should then be expanded to be as detailed as possible.

**Part 8: Evaluation of Site Significance:** Most RPFs leave this section blank, even when sites are identified in the CAA. The Rules only require the RPF to provide a preliminary determination of significance of identified archaeological and historical sites if damaging effects from timber operations cannot be avoided. If the RPF does provide an initial assessment of site significance, the analysis must utilize the significance criteria in the definition for a *significant archaeological or historical* site found in Section 895.1 of the Rules. The significance assessment must also utilize any information provided by Native Americans and provide a context statement pertaining to archaeological, historical and ethnographic data pertinent to the region. It should also consider the physical characteristics of the archaeological or historical site. If the RPF is protecting the site from adverse effect and has recorded the site, then this section does not need to be completed. Instead, simply provide a statement that since the site will be protected and recorded, significance information is not required.

However, be aware that CDF will require the RPF to provide extensive support backing a statement that the site is not significant. Almost every prehistoric archaeological site has potential to meet significance criterion (a) (information potential), and it may be more difficult and costly to demonstrate lack of significance, particularly if subsurface testing is needed. When RPFs encounter situations where damaging effects to sites cannot be avoided, a detailed discussion of site significance must be included in this section. Brief arguments dismissing site significance without adequate support are unlikely to result in CDF approval. If you determine that an archaeological site is not significant under the Rules, but the CDF Archaeologist disagrees, the RPF has the following options:

- Develop protection measures that will avoid damaging effects and record the site. Make changes to the discussion of significance as recommended by the CDF Archaeologist.
- Hire a Professional Archaeologist to study the site and prepare a written report pursuant to 14CCR 929.7 [949.7, 969.7]. CDF will then make the final determination of significance based upon the results of that study report.
- Exclude the site area from the THP.
- If the RPF does not agree to any of the first three options and refuses to change the plan, CDF may deny the plan. In that situation the RPF may appeal CDF's decision to the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection.

**Part 9: Protection Measures:** You will need to list the specific enforceable protection measures to be implemented for each identified site. The sites should be listed using the same site designations in Part 7, with the specific protection measures included for each listed site. Describe measures designed to ensure protection within the site boundary and within 100 feet of the site boundary. Complete avoidance is the preferred treatment both within the site boundary and within the 100 foot buffer zone mentioned in the Rules. When the RPF proposes complete avoidance within the site but careful logging within the 100 foot zone surrounding it, specific measures to ensure the protection of such sites will be required. CDF recommends RPF supervision in those instances to provide greater assurance that marked trees will be felled the correct way and the site will not be harmed. If complete protection is not possible or is impractical, the RPF will need to develop a detailed plan involving limited timber operations and specific, enforceable protection measures. This plan will then be carefully reviewed by a CDF Archaeologist and key elements of that protection plan included in the second written Notice to Native Americans, if the site is a Native American resource. If limited timber operations are proposed within site boundaries, then the detailed plan must be written to avoid significant adverse impacts to that site.

If CDF determines that the proposed timber operations may cause a substantial adverse change to a significant archaeological or historical site and the RPF and the Director cannot agree upon protection measures, a Professional Archaeologist provided by the THP submitter shall conduct a study and prepare a report on the potentially affected site or sites and the potential impacts of the proposed timber operations. This report shall, at a minimum, contain recommendations for mitigation, the elimination of impacts, or for the reduction of impacts to avoid or prevent substantial adverse change to significant archaeological or historical sites, and shall meet the standards of Preservation Planning Bulletin Number 4 December 1989, Office of Historic Preservation), entitled Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format. The Director shall make the final determination of significance and substantial adverse change based on advice of a Professional Archaeologist, in accordance with 14 CCR 929.7, 949.7, and 969.7. Enforceable protection measures within 100 feet of the site may include one or more of the following protection measures: avoidance, felling trees away from the site, and/or an equipment exclusion zone (EEZ). Detailed information on site impacts and appropriate protection measures is available in the Reference Manual and Study Guide for the CDF – CLFA Archaeological Training Program For Registered Professional Foresters And Other Resource Professionals.

**Part 10: Meeting with the LTO:** The RPF or supervised designee familiar with on-site conditions must meet with the LTO prior to the start of timber operations at each site requiring avoidance or protection. The LTO must be shown the location, extent, and boundaries of each site requiring avoidance or protection, and the specific protection measures and confidentiality requirements shall be discussed. To complete this section of the CAA, indicate how this meeting has been or will be handled. Check the appropriate box describing whether the meeting has taken place. If the meeting between the RPF or supervised designee is conducted prior to completing the CAA, provide information such as the names of the parties meeting at each site, what information was discussed, and what, if any, part of the CAA was provided to the LTO.

**Part 11: Site Recording:** The RPF is responsible for providing CDF with site records completed in accordance with currently acceptable professional standards for each archaeological or historical site determined to be significant and those sites that the RPF elects to record but for which no determination of significance has been made. If the RPF chooses to not record sites identified with the site survey area, then the plan must contain a detailed analysis supporting a preliminary determination that the site lacks significance. Check the appropriate boxes in Part 11 and list the sites that were recorded. If the RPF chooses to complete the CAA with a preliminary finding of lack of significance, CDF recommends that you provide a brief statement in Part 11 justifying as to why the site will not be recorded (such as the RPF's preliminary finding that the site is not significant, as discussed in Part 8). The required detailed analysis supporting that finding should be included in Part 8, not Part 11.

CDF offers the following additional suggestions concerning site recording:

- Site records must be included with the CAA at the time the THP is submitted to CDF. The Rules that became effective January 1, 2003 no longer give the RPF the option of submitting them any time prior to THP approval; if properly completed site records are not included with the CAA at submittal, the plan will be returned.
- If the site was previously recorded you may need to update the site record by re-recording it, particularly if the existing record does not meet current standards or if new information pertaining to the site was found.
- When determining the appropriate level of recording needed for each site, the following general guidelines can be used; bear in mind that some sites may need additional recordation above these suggested levels. Small, recent, or ubiquitous sites such as historic can dumps, minor ditch segments, etc. may qualify for recording with the minimum acceptable standard, which is a 2-page record including a completed Primary Record and Location Map. Small prehistoric sites (such as sparse lithic scatters) which are to be completely avoided can also be recorded with a Primary Record and Location Map, although CDF recommends the inclusion of a Site Map to ensure the site can be relocated in the future. Larger, more complex sites should be recorded using at least a 4-page record consisting of a Primary Record, Archaeological Site Record, Site Map, and Location Map. In general, all but the very simplest resources should be recorded with a Primary Record, Location Map, and an appropriate detailed recording form or forms (e.g., Archaeological Site Record, Linear Feature Record, Milling Station Record, Rock Art Record). Any significant site that will not be completely avoided must be recorded to the 4-page standard (Primary Record, Archaeological Site Record, Site Map, and Location Map) and CDF may require operational details mapped on the Site Map such as specific trees to be felled, direction of felling, and location of skid trails to be used. Sites containing diagnostic artifacts should include scale drawings of the artifacts and/or photographs.
- RPFs are encouraged to review two important references related to site recording available on our web pages at http://www.indiana.edu/~e472/cdf/suggest/index.html. These are *Suggestions for Preparing Archaeological Site Records and Site Maps* (Betts 2001) and *Instructions for Recording Historical Resources* (OHP 1995).

**Part 12: Other Applicable Information:** This section is intended to be used if the author wishes to provide any other applicable information that did not fit well in the previous sections of the report. In past years we have seen RPFs discuss logging history, landownership information, future development and/or resources found outside the site survey area.

**Part 13: Attachments:** The following attachments must be included with the Confidential Archaeological Addendum:

- A copy of the completed records check request and its accompanying map, and the written response from the appropriate Information Center including all information and/or site records provided by the IC.

- An example of your correspondence with the local Native American tribal groups and individuals including maps, and any response you have received.
- Site records including maps. Include original photos rather than photocopies of photos.
- Archaeological Coverage Map or Maps, one of which must be a USGS 7.5-min. quad map (or digitally generated topographic equivalent) at 1:24,000 scale. The map must show a north arrow, scale, project boundary, location of all archaeological and historic sites identified (with site size and configuration mapped accurately), regardless of significance, and specific areas examined during the archaeological survey. Make sure the designations used to list sites in Parts 7, 8, and 9 are the same designators used to differentiate mapped site locations on the Archaeological Coverage Map. Additional maps at other scales to provide increased clarity are encouraged, and in small plans may be necessary, but the 1:24,000 scale map is always required. The reason for this is to enable accurate transfer of site locations and survey coverage areas onto the official base maps kept at the Information Centers which are original 7.5 minute topographic quadrangle sheets.

**Additional Suggestions:** The Forest Practice Rules allow RPFs and other Resource Professionals with archaeological training provided by CDF to complete archaeological surveys and satisfy rule requirements during the preparation of most THPs. RPFs should be ready to recognize those situations where a Professional Archaeologist may be needed. Such situations may include plans containing complex archaeological or historical sites, a large number of such sites, plans with timber operations that may damage sites, or a plan where the RPF does not feel comfortable with the adequacy of the archaeological survey and determines that this particular plan would benefit from the involvement of a Professional Archaeologist. You may request a Referral List of Professional Archaeologists from your local Information Center.

CDF has six Professional Archaeologists on staff that are available for consultation and assistance to RPFs. Their names, office locations, and telephone numbers are listed below. Their assigned areas, mailing addresses, email addresses, and mobile telephone numbers are listed at http://www.indiana.edu/~e472/cdf/staff/staff.html

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Dan Foster | Sacramento | (916) 653-0839 |
| Rich Jenkins | Redding | (530) 224-4749 |
| Linda Sandelin | Fresno | (559) 243-4119 |
| Steve Grantham | Fortuna | (707) 726-1251 |
| Chuck Whatford | Santa Rosa | (707) 576-2966 |
| Gerrit Fenenga | Sacramento | (916) 651-2021 |